

REMARKS

In the first office action, it was initially pointed out that the application does not contain an Abstract. Accordingly, submitted with this response is an Abstract as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b).

Claims 4-19 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form with regard to the use of multiple dependent claims. With this amendment, all multiple dependencies have been eliminated from the claims.

Applicants further note the objection to claim 1 with regard to the phrase "to the body to same in articulated manner." Applicants have deleted this language as suggested by the Examiner.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner points out that the recitation "e.g., caddie cart" renders the claim indefinite. With this amendment, applicants have amended the claim to recite a small vehicle. Claim 1 has been further amended to recite that the stub axles are attached to the body via a hinge to provide proper antecedent basis for the term "hinge." Claims 1-3, as amended, are believed to be in compliance with §112, second paragraph.

The remaining claims have been amended to clarify some of the language and correct spelling errors. Basis for all of the amendments may be found in the application as originally filed.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,715,774 issued to Cassoni. Cassoni teaches a motorized golf cart. The Examiner asserts that Cassoni teaches all of the claimed limitations, including a body with two wheels connected to the body via stub axles (7), and a spring (11) which engages on one side at the body and on the other at the stub axles via a hinged area. However, applicants wish to point out that the spring (11) of Cassoni extends from the stub axles close to the wheel and in substantial distance from the hinge by which the stub axles are connected to the upper body portion. As a result, the respective springs 11 obstruct the space between the stub axles and require a corresponding space so that the stub axles cannot be folded back in a position "up against the body" (as shown

in Figs. 4 and 5 and as recited in claim 1) because the respective springs would still extend between the stub axles and the body. In contrast, with the claimed vehicle, the springs may be included with either the stub axles or the body itself and the spring forces only act via the same hinge area by which the stub axles are connected to the body. This also allows the use of a gas spring inside either the stub axles or the body portion and also provides for a better space saving collapsed position of the whole device which is neater in appearance. Accordingly, claims 1-3 are not anticipated by Cassoni.

For all of the above reasons, applicants submit that claims 1-19, as amended, are patentable over the cited reference. Early notification of allowable subject matter is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

DINSMORE & SHOHL LLP

By /Susan M. Luna/
Susan M. Luna
Registration No. 38,769

One Dayton Centre
One South Main Street, Suite 1300
Dayton, Ohio 45402-2023
Telephone: (937) 449-6400
Facsimile: (937) 449-6405

SML/